

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **10 October 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-11, 13-29, 31-47, and 49-54. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 49, 51, 52, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruce Schneier (*Applied Cryptography 2nd Edition*, Oct. 1995, John Wiley & Sons Pub. pages 43-57, hereinafter “Schneier”) in view of Medvinski et al (*Public Key Utilizing Tickets for Application Servers*, hereinafter “Medvinski”) and Kohl et al (*The Kerberos Network Authentication Service, Network Working Group Request For Comments (RFC) 1510*, Sept. 1993, hereinafter “Kohl”). Claims 14, 17, 32, 35, 50, and 53 were rejected as being unpatentable over Schneier in view of Medvinski. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 29, 38, 39, 42, 43, 46, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier in view of Medvinski and Sirbu et al (*Public Key Based Ticket Granting service in Kerberos*, hereinafter “Sirbu”) and ON.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 19, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneier in view of Medvinski and Kohl.

Applicant respectfully points out that the combined teaching of Schneier, Medvinski and Kohl suggests that if a client’s temporary secret key (maintained by a KDC) is due to expire, the client is responsible for taking appropriate actions (such as notifying a user) (see Kohl, page 57, “Key Expiration.”)

In contrast, the instant application describes a process to establish a new temporary secret key for a server when the current one expires. Specifically, the server will not periodically initiate a process to establish a new temporary secret key when the old one expires. Instead, the server **waits until the KDC generates a request for a new temporary secret key**, and in response to the request, the

server then initiates the process to generate the new temporary secret key (see page 11, lines 12-20 of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully submits that given the short lifespan of a temporary secret key, periodically establishing a new temporary secret key can involve a high overhead, especially if the server is rarely accessed through the KDC. The present invention is beneficial because it teaches establishing a new temporary secret key only in response to a request from the KDC.

There is nothing within Schneier, Medvinski and Kohl, either separately, or in concert, which suggests that the owner of the temporary secret (either a server or a client) initiates a process to establish a new temporary secret key only at the request of the KDC that maintains the temporary secret.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 19, and 37 to clarify that a new temporary secret key is established in response to a request for a new temporary secret key generated by the KDC in order to avoid the overhead of periodically establishing a new temporary secret key. These amendments find support on page 11, lines 12-20 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 19, and 37 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-11 and 13-18, which depend upon claim 1, claims 21-29 and 31-36, which depend upon claim 19, and claims 38-47 and 49-54, which depend upon claim 37, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Shun Yao

Registration No. 59,242

Date: January 10, 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com